

health care fraud and abuse control program to coordinate Federal, State, and local law enforcement actions and funding is increased for investigation, reviews, and prosecutions.

To provide greater access to health care, the agreement fights discrimination in the Tax Code against millions of small, self-employed business men and women by giving them virtually the same rights as large corporations to deduct their health insurance costs. It allows tax deductions for long-term health care needs, and it allows terminally ill patients and their families to receive tax-free accelerated death benefits from their insurance companies.

The President and his liberal allies insist on perpetuating big Government policies and socialized health care. America rejected it in 1993, and they do not want it today. The Health Coverage Availability and Affordability Act of 1996 ensures portable, affordable health care for working Americans.

It is time the Clinton liberals stop dragging their feet and came to the negotiating table.

DO NOT PUT HARD-WORKING AMERICANS AT RISK

HON. GREG LAUGHLIN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1996

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, like other Members of this body, I abhor terrorism and support ongoing efforts to reduce the spread of weapons of mass destruction. But I also want to be sure that we do not hurt hard-working Americans in our efforts to achieve foreign policy objectives. From the outset, I have been particularly concerned that enactment of this bill might hurt the citizens of the 14th District of Texas and American families throughout the country.

As the chairman of the Trade Subcommittee knows, I was particularly concerned that the bill, as reported by the International Relations Committee, could have two potentially harmful effects. First, the initial bill would have put at risk the jobs of Americans at totally innocent U.S. subsidiaries of foreign companies. Second, the initial bill could be read to apply retroactively to investment commitments made and contractual obligations undertaken many years ago.

Through the strong leadership and personal intervention of the chairman of the full committee and of the Trade Subcommittee, these concerns have been addressed. I am gratified that the unprecedented innocent subsidiary provision was dropped in its entirety. That change alone will ensure that workers in my district will not have their livelihoods affected by the actions of others that were well beyond their control. Moreover, the bill was redrafted to ensure that the long-standing principle of contract sanctity is preserved. To eliminate any possible interpretive ambiguity, the definition of investment makes clear that the legislation applies only to activities undertaken pursuant to an agreement entered into with the Government of Iran or the Government of Libya (or nongovernmental entities formed by those governments) after the date of enactment. Thus, for example, companies can continue to honor their contractual obligations under existing contracts without fear of being

sanctioned. As a result, the supply of services and other subcontracts, farm-in arrangements, and the like in connection with contracts entered into prior to the date of enactment will not expose companies to potential sanctions. Similarly, companies may continue the development of oil resources as contemplated under exploration and production-sharing agreements signed long before introduction of this legislation. By addressing these legitimate concerns of the business community, our committee has preserved an important principle while reducing the likely exposure of U.S. companies and U.S. workers to foreign government retaliation.

As the administration made clear in its testimony before the Trade Subcommittee, it too shares my concerns about the potential unintended consequences of the legislation. I was pleased that the administration indicated that the bill should apply only prospectively, to future contracts and to future investments. With the bill before us today, the administration should be in a better position to ensure that hard-working Americans in the 14th District or anywhere in our great land will not be put at risk.

In closing, I wish to again commend our Committee leadership for producing a bill that maintains long-standing principles, reduces the risk of harmful retaliation, and provides the President with the flexibility needed to ensure that the American economy is not adversely affected by our pursuit of foreign policy objectives.

HONORING "OLD" JOE CLARK

HON. HAROLD ROGERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1996

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of southern Kentucky's country music legends, "Old" Joe Clark.

"Old" Joe recently celebrated his 50th year of performing at Renfro Valley, Kentucky's premier country music venue. He has been making us laugh with his unique brand of country humor and skillful banjo-picking for the last half century. He is a true treasure of the Commonwealth.

"Old" Joe came to Renfro Valley after entertaining folks in and around his home of Johnson City, TN. After sharpening his talents in Tennessee, "Old" Joe attracted the attention of Renfro Valley's founder, John Lair. And, as they say, the rest is history.

It did not take long for "Old" Joe's fame to spread throughout southern Kentucky. And, he was soon a part of the national country music scene. He appeared at the Grand Ole Opry and performed with some of the Nation's top country stars.

"Old" Joe Clark talents are legendary at Renfro Valley. For 50 years, he has set the standard for an entire generation of country musicians and comedians. Without a doubt, "Old" Joe has left his mark on the Renfro Valley community.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to honor "Old" Joe Clark on his 50th anniversary at Renfro Valley. I know that the people of southern Kentucky love Joe and appreciate his lifetime of service to entertain us.

TRIBUTE TO WENDY GUEY, 1996 NATIONAL SPELLING BEE WINNER

HON. MARK ADAM FOLEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1996

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to salute an exceptional student from Palm Beach County, FL, Miss Wendy Guey. At 12 years old, Wendy attends the Palm Beach County School of the Arts and was the winner of the 1996 Scripps Howard National Spelling Bee.

Not only a talented pianist and violinist, Miss Guey is also a bright, young lady who calmly spelled vivisepture to become a national champion. To get through the early rounds, she spelled correctly—parquet, multifarious, and gesticulate. Aside from a small shopping trip, she donated \$200 to her school while the rest of the prize money has been put away for college.

This was Miss Guey's fourth National Spelling Bee. In 1993, she came in fourth place at the unbelievable age of 9. This year, she came back after missing two words in previous rounds to win the championship.

Perhaps most importantly, Miss Guey has reached a level that all American students should strive to achieve. Education cannot be emphasized enough; our children need to be prepared to attain the skilled positions that will await them in the future. For the United States to compete on the international level, young individuals such as Miss Guey need to become the role models for all students.

I am proud to recognize Miss Guey for her victory as well as her parents Mr. and Mrs. Ching and Susan Guey of Palm Beach Gardens. We should all be proud to salute Wendy for her achievements and wish her the best of luck in her future endeavors.

POSTAL REFORM

HON. JOHN M. McHUGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1996

Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, the following letter by Postmaster General Marvin Runyon was published in the June 1, 1996 Washington Post as a rebuttal to an earlier Washington Post column calling for the creation of a Government commission to address the complex issues of postal reform. The authors of the original article—Messrs. David Ginsburg, Murray Comarow, Robert Hardesty and David Harris—argued in their guest column, "Delivery for the Postal Service," that postal reform would best be addressed through the creation of a Government commission to report and analyze these important public policy issues. While I do not embrace that conclusion, I included their column in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 6.

In his rebuttal, Mr. Runyon argues to the contrary and says that the Postal Service cannot wait for results of findings of a commission. Mr. Runyon stresses that the Postal Service has begun to meet the demands of today's mail delivery and that legislative reforms are needed to keep it thriving for years to come. I will be introducing such legislation in the next few days.